

**From:** donius@host.warwick.net@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 12/9/01 12:30pm  
**Subject:** Settlement

I really must wonder at what point the government is going to protect us from this monopoly.

The first thing is that I believe Microsoft should not be broken up. They make good software, and the company's demise would be unfortunate.

The second suggestion I heard at one time was making them open source their code. Although I prefer open source software myself, I think it is ridiculous to  
not allow corporate secrets.

I suggest that the "coding" of files be required to be registered in the Library of Congress for all computer files. If Microsoft makes a better word processor, fine.

But to lock up the way the resultant data files are written and read with a given platform is wrong. Let it be that the programming code for the program is their

trade secret, but the way the data file is written is in the public domain. This way if company "Z" chose to create a competing word processor, it would be able

to compete by being able to accurately interpret other programs output files.

This idea is in my mind the one solution that opens up competition, and takes nothing away from innovation. In fact it should increase innovation, because now

a company's product would actually have to perform better in order to sell.

As for the ridiculous concept of a punishment being to increase their infiltration further, locking in even more people to their own products, while not actually

costing the company anything, I would love to know who came up with that idea. Your department really does not seem to understand what the root of this

whole problem is. They own like 92% of the market, and their punishment is increasing it to 96%? Please do not use increasing a monopoly's reach as a way  
to punish them.

Donald Wilson  
17 Snufftown rd.  
Goshen NY 10924

wilson@warwick.net